

**Review of UCLA's Efforts to Develop New Performance Indicators:  
A Report to the WASC Accreditation Visiting Team**

**Provided in Preparation for the June 1-2, 1998 Site Visit**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE NEED FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS .....	1
III. EFFORTS TO DEVELOP PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ASSESSMENT CAPABILITIES .....	2
A. The Performance Indicators Advisory Committee .....	3
B. The Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning .....	5
C. Other New Practices or Modes of Evaluation .....	6
D. How Work on Performance Indicators Is Linked to Other Special Topics .....	7
IV. LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT .....	7
V. PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE FUTURE EFFORTS .....	8
A. Focus on promoting internal self-improvement rather than satisfying external audiences .....	8
B. Recognize the growing importance of performance indicators for external reporting .....	8
C. Strengthen the performance indicator production “pipeline” .....	8
D. Provide sufficient analytic “infrastructure” .....	9
E. Clarify the functions and uses of assessment data or performance indicators .....	9
F. Work across levels of analysis .....	10
G. Combine “top down” and “bottom up” approaches .....	10
H. Connect indicators to planning themes and institutional initiatives .....	10
VI. SYSTEMS NOW IN USE FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE .....	11
A. UCLA Operating Systems .....	11
B. Analytic Databases .....	12
C. Routine and Ad Hoc Reports .....	13
D. Performance Indicators .....	14
E. Use of Information and Analysis .....	14
F. Cooperative Activities Within and Beyond the University of California .....	15
VII. CONCLUSION .....	16
INDEX TO REVIEWER REQUESTS	
APPENDICES	

**Review of UCLA's Efforts to Develop New Performance Indicators:  
A Report to the Accreditation Visiting Team**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Although UCLA is data-rich, the desire to enhance our use of these resources to assess institutional effectiveness and inform planning and decisionmaking was the underlying rationale for the selection of performance indicators as one of three special topics for accreditation. The WASC Visiting Team was first introduced to these matters during their initial March 5-6 site visit, when they met with a variety of campus leaders to discuss performance assessment as it relates to undergraduate education, graduate education and research, and faculty workload.

As an outgrowth of the visit, the Team requested additional information and suggested that UCLA prepare a paper that outlines an "institutional vision" for performance indicators and describes the: (a) approaches to performance assessment now in place; (b) new approaches under consideration; (c) process for developing and managing a performance indicator system; (d) connections among the three special WASC topics of Performance Indicators, Diversity, and General Education; and (e) plans for responding to the Office of the President's Phase II assessment initiative. This paper is intended to fulfill this request. (The index at the end of this paper maps the organization of this paper against the issues that the Team recommended we address.)

The Team's comments during and after the March visit caused campus leaders to reconsider and substantially modify UCLA's approach to the development of new performance indicators. This paper begins by providing some institutional background on the need for performance indicators. It then reviews recent efforts to enhance UCLA's capabilities, including a revised leadership approach, followed by a series of principles that will guide our work. We conclude with a description of various categories and systems of data that now exist and how we use these data in planning and decisionmaking. We note that this last section provides important contextual background, substantiating that we do have rich information resources to support continued enhancement and development.

**II. THE NEED FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

UCLA's need for a system of performance indicators is simple: it will support and enhance strategic planning and decisionmaking. One only needs to consider UCLA's recent history to understand how true this is.

The early 1990s were a time of severe budget cuts for UCLA, as for most public higher education institutions, and UCLA underwent a process of retrenchment, reorganization, and decentralization. It was a period of great unease, but one in which the delegation of greater authority to the academic units was a cornerstone. By the mid 1990s, budgets began to stabilize, albeit at reduced levels, and opportunities were sought

and found for investment in new initiatives. Local entrepreneurialism was encouraged by campus and systemwide leaders. Paralleling this, a new strategic planning process was introduced to tighten the links between planning and budgeting and between institution-wide and unit-specific goals.

These conditions increased UCLA's need for performance information. Central administration needs such information as an accountability mechanism, to ensure that units are fulfilling their obligations. Deans, provosts, and other academic leaders also need performance information, so they can supplement observation, anecdotes, external ratings or rankings, and operational data or reports with more systematic analyses of their organizations. The professional literature on organizational behavior underscores the importance of this need. For example, in a review of the factors that contribute to effective decentralization, Strauss (1996) wrote: "Successful decentralization requires a centrally maintained management information system providing local and central managers with timely and accurate performance reports" (p. 165)<sup>1</sup>.

Similar organizational transformations at the systemwide level added to UCLA's desire for performance information. In response to the changing budgetary climate of the early and mid 1990s, The University of California Office of the President (UCOP) delegated more budgetary authority and flexibility to the nine UC campuses, thereby increasing its own need for performance information as a means of holding the campuses accountable for achieving certain goals. The UCOP Phase I and Phase II assessment plans ("*Means for Achieving and Monitoring Compliance with the Governor's Compact*," previously distributed to the Visiting Team) were intended to fulfill this need at the systemwide level. Although many of the measures that UCOP proposed using do not adequately reflect UCLA's institutional activities and accomplishments, UCOP had plans and commitments to use these measures internally and externally.

Concerns about these measures became the focus of UCLA's work on performance measures, to the exclusion of internal information needs. Campus leaders hoped that UCLA's nascent effort to improve performance information might lead to more acceptable alternatives that would benefit the University, particularly in Sacramento.

### **III. EFFORTS TO DEVELOP PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ASSESSMENT CAPABILITIES**

Over the past year, UCLA has made two major efforts to expand its use of performance indicators: the establishment of a Performance Indicators Advisory Committee, and the establishment of a Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning.

The Performance Indicators Advisory Committee initiated its work in Fall, 1997, against the backdrop described in Section II. It made some important contributions, but encountered obstacles to continued progress. The March accreditation site visit helped us realize that our focus had been diverted from one of establishing and implementing

---

<sup>1</sup> Strauss, J., J. Curry, & E. Whalen (1996). Revenue Responsibility Budgeting. In Massy, W. F. (ed.), *Resource Allocation in Higher Education*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

accountability measures to support decentralization to one of reformulating measures to protect the organization.

The Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning began its work in March and hence benefited from the lessons learned through the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee. This workgroup shows great promise for achieving its goals. Both efforts are described below.

#### **A. The Performance Indicators Advisory Committee**

Before UCLA began its planning for WASC re-accreditation, then-Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget, Theodore Mitchell, initiated some work on performance indicators by convening an *ad hoc* workgroup of faculty and staff. This work was borne out of UCLA's development of a form of Responsibility Center Management, which improved the quality and quantity of information about fiscal performance. This new effort was intended to improve the quality and quantity of information about other forms of performance, particularly the core institutional activities of education, research, and service.

Work on performance indicators received broader attention when the UCLA Accreditation Steering Committee decided to select this topic as one of three reaccreditation foci. After several additional meetings of the *ad hoc* workgroup, Executive Vice Chancellor Charles Kennel appointed a Performance Indicators Advisory Committee with Dr. Mitchell as chair in July, 1997. The charge letter (previously provided to the Visiting Team) asked the committee to: (a) identify gaps or weaknesses in the institutional data and analyses currently used to assess institutional effectiveness; (b) formulate recommendations for improving the assessment of institutional effectiveness; and (c) propose a plan for implementing these recommendations.

The Committee was also expected to suggest changes or alternatives to the performance indicators already in use as part of the UC Compact with the Governor. Especially in the areas of undergraduate education, research, and faculty workload, the Governor's Compact indicators do not adequately reflect our institutional activities and accomplishments, and it was felt that UCLA's efforts might lead to improvements of value to all UC campuses.

A number of problems hindered the progress of the Advisory Committee. The major problem was that the perceived risks and pressures associated with UCOP's Phase I and Phase II assessment plans led the Committee to focus more on external audiences than internal needs, and also caused the Committee to emphasize the *content* of specific performance indicators prematurely, before sufficient attention to *process* had been paid. Other problems included:

- Turnover in critical executive positions made it difficult to maintain the level of leadership and momentum that was necessary to sustain this effort and ensure success.
- UCOP set aside its "Phase II Assessment and Accountability" plans, eliminating short-term pressures for the campus to develop performance measures for external purposes.

- As the WASC Visiting Team pointed out, work on the three topics (undergraduate education, research, and faculty workload) was not framed in a manner that was directly connected to ongoing initiatives, institutional planning, resource allocation, or decisionmaking.
- While there was shared dissatisfaction with existing accountability measures, there was very little agreement about what more satisfactory alternatives might be. Committee members disagreed not only about technical issues such as the appropriate unit of analysis, the trade-offs between quantitative and qualitative data, and so forth, but also about the most fundamental issues of epistemology and methodology.
- Some members of the Committee were unconvinced that UCLA should develop new performance indicators out of concern that they would be misinterpreted, misused, or create new problems. In addition, some thought that new data or information would reduce their degrees of freedom, substitute for human judgment, or create new problems. Others maintained that the collection, analysis, and presentation of statistical or other quantitative information are necessary but not sufficient means to institutional progress. Since more things need to be judged in the affairs of the university than can be measured, the relationship between measurement and judgment is crucial and fundamental. While addressing this basic theoretic question, a practical response to present needs is to locate, describe, improve and coordinate the various statistical and quantitative tools that already exist.

Had circumstances been different, it is likely that many of these issues could have been resolved over time, but this was not possible before the March 5-6 site visit by the Visiting Team. That visit helped UCLA to focus attention on the difficulties facing the Committee, the changing circumstances surrounding the Committee, and the need to reconsider our approach.

Nonetheless, the Committee achieved some important advances. A set of interviews with faculty, department chairs and deans pointed to unmet information needs and also clarified the perceived benefits and risks of a “performance indicators” approach to assessment (See January, 1998, *Performance Indicators for Education, Research, & Workload: Input from UCLA Faculty and Administrators*, previously provided to the Visiting Team). A draft set of performance indicators also provides a point of departure for further work (See January, 1998, *Performance Indicators as Vital Signs*, previously provided to the Visiting Team). In addition, the Committee’s discussions have highlighted some of the concerns and fears that must be addressed if performance indicators are to be accepted as valid, credible, and constructive by the campus community.

More progress was made during the March 5-6 accreditation site visit. Three sessions on performance indicators for undergraduate education, research and graduate education, and faculty workload involved top administrators (the Provost of the College of Letters and Science, the Vice Chancellor for Research, and the Vice Chancellor for

Academic Personnel, respectively) as discussion leaders and also provided opportunities for a wide range of faculty to join the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee in consideration of campus information needs. These discussions will affect future work. Additionally, feedback from the Visiting Team underscored the need to clarify the uses of new performance indicators and to resolve process issues before attempting to gain broad institutional acceptance of any set of performance measures.

## **B. Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning**

This workgroup was established in January, 1998, about six months after the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee began its efforts. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate Division Claudia Mitchell-Kernan convened the group and serves as Chair. The charge letter (see Appendix A) describes three responsibilities of the group:

- (1) assess the type of institutional data and other information resources required for effective academic planning;
- (2) develop policies, procedures and administrative frameworks which address these needs;
- and (3) establish a unified database which facilitates analysis of issues and trends related to academic quality and accountability.

The overriding goal of the Workgroup on Data Resources is to make better use of available data to support academic and strategic planning. The workgroup launched its efforts with a two-day off-site retreat in late March to begin development of a model for a database that would support the planning process. The group now meets on a bi-weekly basis.

Under Vice Chancellor Mitchell-Kernan's leadership, the Graduate Division has successfully developed a relational database (the Enterprise Information System), which efficiently supports a variety of analyses and reports about graduate programs and students. There was a consensus that it would be of value to the campus if this model was extended to incorporate other dimensions, such as undergraduate students, faculty, and academic programs.

One objective of the Workgroup is to develop a proposal for a unified database that can be presented to the new Executive Vice Chancellor when he assumes his appointment.<sup>2</sup> The proposal will include a rationale for the database, initial specifications of the information and analyses that the database will support, recommendations and examples of how the information and analyses should be used in planning, and a budget for establishing and maintaining database functions. A technical work group is being convened to review existing campus databases and recommend whether and how to link them or bring them together in a data warehouse. Appendix B displays a preliminary data model, developed within the Graduate Division, that is being used to launch this technical work.

A second and complementary objective is the development of a report for the new Executive Vice Chancellor discussing how performance measures can support academic planning. The report will make specific suggestions regarding the descriptive and

---

<sup>2</sup> A new Executive Vice Chancellor has been appointed but will not begin for several months.

comparative indicators that will serve to inform campus leaders; promote more systematic, transparent, and consistent assessment of institutional performance; and encourage self-improvement within the organization.

Toward this end, two subgroups of the Workgroup are preparing short “position papers” on performance indicators for academic planning in the areas of undergraduate and graduate education. In addition, Vice Chancellor Mitchell-Kernan will ask Vice Chancellor for Research Kumar Patel and Administrative Vice Chancellor Pete Blackman to prepare position papers about performance indicators that will support planning in each of their areas of responsibility. Additional working papers will be prepared after these initial efforts are completed and reviewed. The position papers on undergraduate and graduate education will be completed in late June, 1998.

It is noteworthy that this effort to develop performance measures is internally rather than externally driven. The vast majority of institutions and systems that have adopted performance indicator systems have done so in response to external mandates or pressure. UCLA’s Workgroup, however, is motivated by an interest in institutional self-improvement. This proactive approach positions the institution well to respond to external accountability issues if and when demands in this area escalate.

### **C. Other New Practices or Modes of Evaluation**

UCLA is engaging in several other efforts to improve performance assessment in the area of undergraduate education. These include:

- The College of Letters and Science has established a Workgroup on General Education Assessment, charged with developing a plan to assess four pilot “cluster courses” to be offered in the 1998-99 academic year. The workgroup will recommend the issues to be examined and the appropriate methodologies for addressing the issues. It also will develop a staffing plan, timeline, and budget. (For more information, see *WASC Progress Report For General Education*.)
- The set of faculty interviews conducted for the Performance Advisory Committee indicated that faculty and department chairs are very interested in obtaining feedback from graduating seniors or alumni who majored in their discipline. Although our Alumni Association conducts periodic alumni surveys, they are only marginally useful for academic planning. At this time, preliminary discussions have been held about approaching alumni surveys in a new way – as collaborative ventures between academic units and the Alumni Association with the goal of involving faculty in their design. Additionally, UCLA’s Career Center engages in periodic assessments’ of students’ post-graduation careers that can be a source of valuable information for curriculum planning and review.
- The Office of Academic Planning and Budget (APB) conducted a pilot survey of the undergraduate student experience in Spring, 1997. The survey deals with academic goals and programs, student satisfaction and factors influencing time to degree. Many items are part of a UC-wide



effort. APB plans to administer a full-scale survey in Spring, 1999 and periodically thereafter.

#### **D. How Work on Performance Indicators Is Linked to Other Special Topics**

The ongoing assessment efforts link performance indicators to the other special topics for WASC Accreditation – namely, General Education and diversity. As described above, a subgroup of the Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning is preparing a position paper on Undergraduate Education, which will include a discussion of performance indicators for General Education. In addition, the General Education team has created a Workgroup on General Education Assessment, which is chaired by a member of the Data Resources Workgroup, thereby assuring a high level of coordination between the groups.

The Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning has also specified that performance indicators for diversity will be incorporated into its work. For example, indicators of quality in undergraduate education will incorporate a consideration of diversity among students, faculty, curriculum, and campus life. Additionally, the WASC Workgroup on Diversity is preparing a recommendation for the Executive Vice Chancellor about the need for focused consideration of the manner in which UCLA collects, analyzes, uses, and communicates diversity-related data and information.

### **IV. LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

The observations of the WASC Visiting Team helped us to step back and reconsider our approach to developing performance indicators. We realized that the efforts of the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee were largely disconnected from decisionmaking or planning processes and weakly linked to institutional goals and initiatives. To redress this situation, recent decisions made by Chancellor Carnesale have led to a restructured approach to the development of performance indicators.

First, Chancellor Carnesale has asserted his desire to strengthen UCLA's analytic capabilities and ensure that future strategic planning efforts have better access to and make more extensive use of empirical information and analysis. Accordingly, he has decided that the performance indicators effort will be led by the incoming Executive Vice Chancellor, who will also have overall responsibility for strategic planning. Specific responsibilities of the Executive Vice Chancellor will include evaluating and strengthening institutional research at UCLA; determining the kinds of performance indicators that are needed at the executive level; ensuring that a performance indicators system is developed; and integrating performance indicators into the strategic planning process.

Second, the Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning has been asked to continue its efforts to develop a proposal for a unified database that would support the academic planning process. The proposal should help the Executive Vice Chancellor move quickly to enhance the use of information and analysis in the planning cycle for the 1999-2000 academic year.

Third, growing out of sessions held during the Visiting Team's first visit, institutional leaders will continue their efforts to conceptualize or design performance indicators in these areas. Fourth, the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee will be placed on hiatus until the Executive Vice Chancellor is ready to take on these tasks. At that time, the EVC will determine if there is a continued role for the Advisory Committee.

This approach provides UCLA's performance indicators effort with strong leadership and be tight links to strategic and academic planning processes. It also provides for continued progress until the new Executive Vice Chancellor is able to devote his attention to these activities.

## **V. PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE FUTURE EFFORTS**

Performance indicators enable us to make better use of our rich data resources, which are described in Section VI. Our experiences over the last year, and particularly the March 5-6 site visit and follow-up letter, have provided us with important insights, and we are renewing our efforts to enhance UCLA's capacity for self-assessment. This section outlines a set of principles that are essential for long-term success.

### **A. Focus on Self-Improvement Rather Than External Self-Representation**

The early efforts of the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee bogged down in concerns about how external audiences might react to or interpret various indicators. There was also concern that such efforts would ultimately become public relations exercises rather than meaningful assessments. We have been able to make more progress by focusing on our internal needs, even as we keep in mind the interests of other potential audiences. UCOP's decision to delay the implementation of their "Phase II" assessment and accountability plans freed us for this internal focus.

### **B. Recognize the Growing Importance of Performance Indicators for External Reporting**

Reporting requirements and external expectations may change over time, varying in scope and intensity, but they will always be with us. There has been a significant expansion of the range of institutional operations and outcomes for which colleges and universities must expect to be held accountable. Performance indicators represent a potentially effective means of responding to at least some of these demands for accountability. State and federal government agencies, peer institutions, professional associations, our own system-wide administration, elected leaders, the press and producers of college guidebooks, and the public at large are among those with rising expectations for standardized evidence regarding institutional performance. These expectations will impel us to a take more proactive, positive, and open stance toward the disclosure of information regarding institutional performance. We must recognize and continue to respond creatively -- but also critically -- to our new responsibilities in this area or face the possible consequence that the indicator systems by which others judge us will be externally-imposed upon us.

### **C. Strengthen the Performance Indicator Production "Pipeline"**

To support the planning process, we must improve the transformation of operational data to management information, and the transformation of management information to performance measures. These tasks require us to build links among data sources; develop credible, valid and reliable performance indicators; and find effective and timely ways to disseminate information and analysis to institutional leaders for use in planning. While the incoming Executive Vice Chancellor will provide overall leadership, these tasks will require the involvement of various institutional leaders, staff, and faculty. To be successful, we must create a broad understanding of the value of information.

#### **D. Provide Sufficient Analytic “Infrastructure”**

During the early 1990s, institutional research at UCLA sustained deep cuts in staff and budget. Some divisions, including the Graduate Division, Student Affairs, Alumni Affairs, and Business Enterprises, have their own analytic units or staff (most of which also were cut back), but it is clear that efforts need to be coordinated and directed toward institutional goals. Thus, it is important for UCLA to conduct a thorough review and evaluation of its institutional research and make structural or organizational changes as needed to strengthen this function.

#### **E. Clarify the Functions and Uses of Assessment Data or Performance Indicators**

Our discussions in the Data Resources Workgroup have suggested three functions that new indicators or assessments can and should fulfill for UCLA:

- 1) Providing *conceptual* information to formulate and illuminate concepts of importance to the institution and, specifically, to strategic and academic planning. In other words, indicators should be linked to key themes, initiatives, values, or goals.
- 2) Providing *navigational and comparative* information that helps us understand where we have come from and where we may be headed. Benchmarks based on data from other institutions or organizations should be included. Information should also enable carefully constructed comparisons across academic units.
- 3) Providing *motivational* information to challenge the campus community and highlight emerging areas of concern. For example, indicators of diversity should stimulate departments to consider how to increase their diversity, and cost indicators should stimulate departments to consider how to increase efficiency.

We have also identified two functions that new indicators cannot and should not provide:

- 1) *Judgment* -- Performance indicators must not be allowed to replace human judgment or determine evaluative conclusions. We must remember that indicators are indirect – and imperfect – surrogates or proxies for complex constructs.
- 2) *Answers* -- Performance indicators cannot tell us what factors *caused* patterns or trends in the data. More is needed, especially qualitative and

quantitative analyses tailored to particular institutional needs. Good information should generate additional questions and probing.

#### **F. Work Across Levels of Analysis**

Our work should focus on multiple levels of analysis. At this time, we have identified three key levels: (a) academic departments; (b) professional schools or divisions of the College of Letters and Science; and (c) UCLA overall. Information about academic departments primarily serves department chairs, although it will also serve the Academic Senate, which oversees the program review process. Information about divisions and schools primarily serves the deans. Performance indicators for UCLA overall serves the Chancellor, the Office of the President, and other external audiences. At later stages of our work, we may consider extending performance indicators to other units, including support services, programs within academic departments, interdisciplinary instructional units or research centers, or affinity groups.

#### **G. Combine “Top Down” and “Bottom Up” Approaches**

Institutional effectiveness in a decentralized environment requires that academic units be held accountable for achieving goals and objectives of importance to the overall institution. Top management needs to compare units on some standard dimensions. Academic units need to assess progress toward their local goals and communicate their needs and aspirations in a manner that fits the local culture. This “bottom up component” is a means to create the acceptance and support necessary for success.

Thus, we plan to use both a common core of performance indicators that can be applied to all academic units, at all levels of analysis, and “customized” indicators for each of the academic units. The common core of indicators will be closely linked to important and enduring institutional goals. Trends in these indicators over time and comparisons to similar units (e.g., other research universities) will fulfill critical “navigational” functions for UCLA. The “customized” indicators will address the academic units’ distinctive goals and responsibilities. In other words, our long-term vision calls for the compilation of a large “library” or “warehouse” of performance measures that units can draw on as needed and appropriate.

#### **H. Connect Indicators to Planning Themes and Institutional Initiatives**

The choice of indicators should emerge from the underlying “themes” or goals that guide the planning process. Examples within UCLA include: (a) improving UCLA’s academic reputation in an era of constrained resources by focusing our efforts rather than attempting to be totally comprehensive; (b) promoting diversity; (c) improving undergraduate education; (d) reducing the fractionation of research, teaching, and service; (e) using technology to enhance education; and (f) supporting the development of high-quality interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary scholarship. Work to date has focused on identifying possible indicators of departmental quality. Similarly, it is important to connect indicators to

important institutional initiatives, including (but not limited to) diversity and general education.

## VI. SYSTEMS NOW IN USE FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE

Although organizational changes have created new information needs, UCLA already uses a wide variety of data and information to assess institutional performance. A great deal of these originate in UCLA's *operating systems*, from which selected data elements are extracted and manipulated to create *analytic databases*. The analytic databases are then used to generate both *standard reports* that are routinely provided to the campus and *ad hoc reports* responsive to special issues. Both types of report typically include data useful as *performance indicators*, such as ratios or frequency distributions. Likewise, UCLA's academic units produce data that may also be used in this way. These inform a variety of *planning and decisionmaking activities* within UCLA. In the remainder of this section, we describe each of these steps in the creation and use of information.

### A. UCLA Operating Systems

As with most other research universities, UCLA's operating systems collect and process a large amount of data about students, faculty, staff, costs, and programs. Some of the major systems from which analytic information is derived are:

- The *Undergraduate Admissions System* is used to process student applications and manage the admissions process. It captures data about UCLA applicants and admits from admissions forms, including student grades and test scores, high school attended, honors and AP courses, demographic information, and so forth.
- The *Graduate Admissions System* captures data about applicants and admits to UCLA's graduate and professional schools.
- The *Financial Aid System* is used to process and monitor financial aid awards and contains data about the level and type of financial support provided to undergraduate and graduate students.
- The *Student Record System* supports the operational needs of the Registrar by maintaining data on course enrollments, grades, registration status, degree objective, and graduation, along with key demographic information.
- UCLA's *Financial Systems* provide data about budgeted and actual resources and expenditures for each of UCLA's departments, divisions, schools, and colleges.
- The *Payroll System* is used to process the UCLA payroll. The system contains a variety of data about academic employees, e.g., faculty, lecturers, and apprentice personnel, that is useful for academic planning and program analysis.

In addition to these major operating systems, a number of other systems with more limited operational use are also valuable sources of data. Systems that serve campus housing, academic advising, and alumni affairs are examples.

## B. Analytic Databases

By extracting elements from the operating systems using standardized methods and schedules (e.g., enrollment counts are based on the third week of the quarter), we build "official" analytic files containing descriptive information about students, faculty, staff, resources, or programs; compare groups or units; and track change over time. Some of the analytic databases that are often used to support planning and decisionmaking are:

- The *Cumulative File*, maintained by Academic Planning and Budget, uses the Undergraduate Admissions and Student Record Systems to compile information about students' academic progress. It details students' progress toward degree, academic achievements, persistence patterns, and graduation information, along with relevant demographic and background information.
- The Graduate Division has developed the *Enterprise Information System*, a relational database with individual-level information about graduate students. The database combines data on admissions, enrollment, degree objectives and achievements, financial support, employment, dissertation titles, and demographics.
- The *Query Data Base (QDB)*, sponsored by Administrative Information Systems, enables campus managers and staff to access financial and administrative information about their units on the World Wide Web. Data can be downloaded for further analysis. Information on the QDB includes budgeted and actual expenditures by category and transaction and by fund and fund groupings such as contracts and grants. In addition, a set of student, faculty, and space measures that are useful for analysis is contained in the QDB. Since its release in 1997, the QDB has become a widely used management and administrative tool.
- *The Instructional Resources Information System (IRIS)* extracts data from the Student Record and Payroll Systems to provide information on faculty instructional workload, including student and faculty FTEs; primary and secondary courses at the lower division, upper division and graduate levels; and student credit hours.

In addition, some databases are derived from student or faculty surveys. Surveys administered at UCLA within the last three years include the CIRP Freshman Survey, CIRP Faculty Survey, surveys of seniors and alumni conducted by various units (e.g., Career Center, Alumni Association, School of Public Health), a student satisfaction survey conducted by Academic Planning and Budget, and a UCOP-sponsored "Cost of Attendance" survey.

## C. Routine and *Ad Hoc* Reports

UCLA's analytic databases support institutional research analyses and reporting. Examples of standard reports generated from the databases are described below.

- The Cumulative File is used to create an annual *persistence and retention report* that presents persistence, retention, and graduation rates as well as time-to-degree and achievement levels for successive cohorts of entering students. Breakdowns by key stratification variables, including student ethnicity, freshman vs. transfer admissions status, and school or college, are also provided. The retention and persistence report is available on the Academic Planning and Budget web site at <http://www.apb.ucla.edu>. (It can also be accessed through the WASC Reaccreditation Portfolio at <http://www.ucla.edu/home/reaccreditation>.)
- The Enterprise Information System is used to construct *academic profiles* of each department focused on graduate students and programs, which are distributed annually to deans and department chairs. A sample profile was provided as part of the display materials for the March 5-6 site visit, and additional materials are displayed in Appendix C.
- The Student Record System database is used to generate two routine instructional workload reports for each department, as well as each college and the university overall. The reports are used to inform curriculum planning (e.g., decisions about how many courses to provide), contrast departmental workload burdens, support the academic program review process and inform decisionmaking concerning faculty and support allocations. The "MP Tables" and the "Class Report" are available on the Academic Planning and Budget Web Site at <http://www.apb.ucla.edu>. (They can also be accessed through the WASC Reaccreditation Portfolio at <http://www.ucla.edu/home/reaccreditation>.)
- Data from all the analytic files described above and others are used to create UCLA's annual *Campus Profile*, which provides statistical snapshots of students, faculty, staff, resources, and programs at UCLA. The Profile is available in hard copy and on the Academic Planning and Budget Web Site at <http://www.apb.ucla.edu>. (It can also be accessed through the WASC Reaccreditation Portfolio at <http://www.ucla.edu/home/reaccreditation>.)

*Ad Hoc* reports include survey results and special analyses. For example, a recent opportunity to substantially expand our School of Engineering and Applied Sciences prompted analyses of both the depth and quality of the School's applicant pools and the workload impact of Engineering majors on departments in the College of Letters and Science. As Regental Resolutions and Proposition 209 required changes in admission criteria, a number of analyses were prepared to simulate and consider the effects of various admissions approaches.

It is important to note that, with few exceptions, UCLA does not prepare specialized analyses or reports for the Office of the President. Rather, Academic Planning and Budget regularly transfers standardized data files to OP, to be merged with data from



the other UC campuses and then used to support a variety of aggregate analyses. Additionally, UCLA is not expected nor encouraged to report directly on its outcomes or effectiveness to the State Legislature, Governor's Office, or California Postsecondary Higher Education Commission – such reporting is the responsibility of OP.

#### **D. Performance Indicators**

Many (although not all) reports derived from UCLA's analytic databases are compilations of performance measures or indicators that inform a particular issue or topic. Although a complete compilation of all the performance indicators used at UCLA is beyond the scope of this effort, Appendix D displays some examples.

#### **E. Use of Information and Analysis**

UCLA academic and administrative leaders utilize quantitative information in a number of important areas. These include:

- *Strategic planning.* The deans, vice chancellors, and provosts prepare or update their strategic plans each year. UCLA's academic planning process creates regular occasions for each major academic unit to develop and analyze data in order to evaluate capacities in instruction, research, physical facilities, staff and operations, finance or other areas. The use of information and analyses in this process is quite variable. Many units do make extensive use of descriptive or comparative analyses. Volume II of the College of Letters and Science's 1997-98 Strategic Plan, for example, presents several hundred pages of tables and charts, mainly in time-series, representing changes in: ladder faculty staffing; National Research Council Rankings; sponsored research; faculty honors and awards; departmental profiles detailing numerous dimensions; endowments/endowed chairs; and private fundraising. Appendix E provides an additional illustration of the use of data and information in strategic planning.
- *Management reviews and budgetary decisionmaking.* As background for the Chancellor and his Executive Budget Committee, Academic Planning and Budget provides a set of comparative statistics and performance indicators about each academic unit (see Appendix F). These reports are helpful in assessing units' budget requests and their relative need for incremental allocations to meet their goals or achieve institution-wide objectives. In addition, UCLA is implementing a form of Responsibility Centered Management. RCM involves a financial model and reporting format displaying the distribution of all revenues and costs for all campus units. The model has already been used to generate new performance indicators that could enhance the analytical process in support of budgetary decisionmaking. The usefulness of these indicators are being reviewed as part of our ongoing parallel test of RCM.
- *Admissions and enrollment planning.* Data on applicants, admits, and new enrollees as well as indicators such as admit rates (percentage of

applicants admitted) and yield rates (percent of admits who enroll) are crucial to our enrollment planning activities.

- *Academic Program Review*. Academic programs are reviewed every eight years in a process coordinated by the Academic Senate. As shown in Appendix G, departments preparing for review receive statistical reports including the Departmental Profile of Graduate Students, Allocations of Graduate Division Student Support, Doctoral Degree Recipients, Enrollment data, Enrollment Trends, Space Inventory, and Sponsored Research Award Transactions. In addition, some departments collect survey data from students or alumni as part of their self-study.

## **F. Cooperative Activities Within and Beyond the University of California**

In addition to internal assessment activities, UCLA also participates in the design and production of performance measures with UCOP, other UC campuses, and institutions beyond the UC system. These cooperative efforts enhance the quality of our internal, institutional analyses and contribute to improved performance measures for the UC system and the higher education sector at large. Some examples of recent cooperative activities include:

- UCLA recently participated in technical discussions and exchanges with UCOP and other UC campuses to develop common standards for reporting graduation rates, counting enrollments in self-supporting and differential-fee academic programs, and reporting faculty payroll activity status.
- UCOP and other UC campuses cooperated on an initiative sponsored by President Atkinson, with the support of the Council of Chancellors, to create uniform reporting protocols for the annual campus submissions to the *US News & World Report Survey of America's Best Colleges*. This process led to standardization of practices for reporting each of the items used to compute institutional rankings by *US News*. Formerly uneven and inconsistent campus practices for reporting were replaced by uniform practices that draw on the capabilities of 'corporate' data files and data runs produced by UCOP. The new protocols will reduce the variation in reported results from campus to campus.
- During the past five years there has been a major change in the way that UCLA and other institutions disclose information to college guide publications. In response to the burden associated with responding to increasing requests from the various guides, higher education institutions and publishers collaborated on the creation of a Common Data Set, now established as a standard core or baseline instrument for gathering campus information that makes creative use of existing data standards. Both the CDS and the UC initiative discussed above represent important and positive steps toward better adjustment to a more market-driven, information-rich environment.
- The *University of California Cost of Attendance Survey*, completed in 1997, represents another area in which cooperation among campuses and

with UCOP led to improvements in designing and administering an important survey, which provides common data for comparing student expenses across the campuses. Results have been accepted by all campuses and have become the basis for large-scale reallocations of financial aid support and the development of new approaches to determining student eligibility for financial aid awards.

- Beyond the UC system, UCLA provides external agencies and peer institutions with performance information. In addition to IPEDS reporting, UCLA (or UCOP in our stead) also responds to several other standard survey requests from higher education cooperative organizations, such as annual faculty salary data reported to AAUP, and the annual survey of library holdings reported to ARL.
- During the past year, UCLA reestablished its long-standing affiliation with the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE). By sharing key performance indicator information and engaging in a national dialogue about indicators and benchmarks with more than 40 peer institutions, we have solidified links with other institutions and organizations and improved our access to an important planning resource.

## **VII. CONCLUSION**

Changes to UCLA's organization, especially decentralization of authority and responsibility to local units, have increased the need for information about institutional and unit performance. UCLA's initial efforts to fulfill this need through creation of a Performance Indicators Advisory Committee made some progress but encountered problems due to insufficient consideration of process issues and weak links between the Committee's work and institutional planning. A more recent effort, the creation of the Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning, is more promising. In combination with strong support from the Chancellor and other institutional leaders, UCLA is well positioned for continued progress as the new Executive Vice Chancellor assumes responsibility for planning and assessment.

### Index to Reviewer Requests for Information

Reviewer Requests	Section of Report Addressing the Request	Page Number
Systems now in use for assessing performance	Systems now in use for assessing performance	Pages 11-16 & Appendix B
Connections across topic areas	Other New Practices & How Work on Performance Indicators Is Linked to Other Special Topics	Pages 6-7
New practices or modes of evaluation under consideration	a) Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning & b) Other New Practices	Pages 5-7
Lines for responsibility for developing and managing performance indicators	Leadership and Management	Page 7
Directions for Phase II of UCOP plan	<i>Not addressed since UCOP has set aside Phase II</i>	
Overall vision and plans	a) Leadership and Management & b) Principles to Guide Future Efforts	Pages 7-10

**APPENDICES FOR:**  
**Review of UCLA's Efforts to Develop New Performance Indicators:**  
**A Report to the WASC Accreditation Visiting Team**

**Provided in Preparation for the June 1-2, 1998 Site Visit**

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A - Charge Letter for Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning

Appendix B - Preliminary Academic Affairs Data Model for an Integrated Database

Appendix C - Sample Departmental Graduate Profile

Appendix D - Selected Performance Indicators Used at UCLA

Appendix E - Example of a Strategic Plan that Demonstrates Use of Data and Performance Measures (Excerpted)

Appendix F - Sample APB Strategic Planning Information Packet

Appendix G - Guidelines for the Self Review Component of Academic Program Review: Institutional and Senate Data Summaries

Appendix A:

Charge Letter for Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning

## Appendix B:

### Preliminary Data Model for Academic Affairs



Appendix C:

Sample Departmental Graduate Profile

## Appendix D:

### Selected Performance Indicators and Measures

## **Selected Performance Indicators and Measures Currently Used for Assessment, Decisionmaking, and Planning at UCLA in the Areas of Undergraduate Education, Faculty Teaching Workload, and Research**

Most indicators listed below are available as summary measures for the campus as a whole, as distributions across discrete academic or research units, and as summary measures for each discrete unit. In use as tools for formal assessment, reporting, or answering decisionmakers' questions, they appear in various combinations, often focused on selected subsections of aggregate populations (e.g. distribution by major, gender, and ethnicity of undergraduates who remain enrolled at UCLA for more than five calendar years).

### **Undergraduate Education**

#### Measures for Undergraduate Academic Programs

##### Program Inventories

- Undergraduate concentrations: Degree programs, major programs, minor programs
- Honors programs and other undergraduate instructional programs
- Other special academic programs (student research program, education abroad, etc.)

##### Student Headcount Enrollment

- Total headcount enrollment by academic quarter and academic year
- Percentage of undergraduate / graduate students
- Percentage of lower division / upper division undergraduates
- Percentage of students with double majors, with minors
- Percentage of upper division undergraduates with no declared major
- Percentage distribution by gender, ethnicity, and other demographics
- Percentage distribution by registration status (new/continuing/readmitted)
- Percentage distribution by student level (fr/so/jr/sr) based on cumulative credit hour units completed
- Percentage distribution by full time/part time status based on current enrolled credit hour units
- Percentage distribution by academic performance (cumulative GPA; honors or probation status)
- Persistence or retention rates for specific entering cohorts
- Graduation or completion rates for specific entering cohorts
- Selected indicators of short and long term changes and trends in above measures over time

##### Baccalaureate Degree Production

- Total degrees awarded by academic quarter and academic year
- Percentage of degree recipients who entered UCLA as transfers
- Percentage of degree recipients with double majors, with minors
- Percentage distribution by gender, ethnicity, and other demographics
- Percentage distribution by academic performance (cumulative GPA; honors or probation status)
- Average time-to-degree, measured in terms of quarters elapsed, quarters registered at UCLA, etc.
- Average total credit hour units accumulated, relation of this total to minimum required units
- Academic performance, measured in terms of honors graduates, GPA distribution, etc.
- Selected indicators of short and long term changes and trends in above measures over time

## Instructional Activity and Student Workload

Number of lower division and upper division course titles offered per quarter  
Number of cross-listed course titles and primary class sections  
Number of primary and secondary class sections offered per quarter  
Number of enrollments in primary and secondary class sections  
Number of scheduled hours of instruction per week in primary and secondary class sections  
Summary classroom utilization patterns by building, room, day of week, and time of day

Average enrollment per primary and secondary class section  
Distribution of primary class sections by class size group  
Percentage of primary class sections with enrollment above or below selected threshold values  
Distribution of enrollment in each primary class by student level  
Distribution of enrollment in each primary class by declared major (major/service enrollment)

Number of independent study (tutorial) enrollments  
Number of honors contract and honors discussion enrollments  
Number of student research program enrollments

Number of student credit hours generated by course level  
Percentage of student credit hours generated by declared majors and non-majors  
Number of FTE students produced at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels

Distribution of grades awarded in each course  
Selected indicators of short and long term changes and trends in above measures over time

## Teaching Resources and Instructional Workload Ratios

Number of FTE faculty positions budgeted for fiscal year  
Number of FTE faculty positions filled for fiscal year  
Number of FTE faculty actually available for instruction  
Number of FTE teaching assistants actually available for instruction

Total academic support core funding and permanent commitments for fiscal year  
Total all-funds expenditures for fiscal year

Selected ratios of headcount enrollment to measures of faculty and financial resources  
Selected ratios of degree production to measures of faculty and financial resources  
Selected ratios of instructional workload to measures of faculty and financial resources

## Measures for Academic Support Programs and Non-Academic Undergraduate Programs

Campus outreach and articulation programs: Numbers and characteristics of students served  
    Studies of student persistence, graduation, and academic performance by program participation  
Campus-wide tutorial and academic advising services: Numbers and characteristics of students served  
    Studies of student persistence, graduation, and academic performance by program participation  
School and College academic advising services: Numbers and characteristics of students served  
Career Center and other post-UCLA counseling services: Numbers and characteristics of students served  
Orientation Programs: Numbers and characteristics of participating students  
Campus Housing Statistics: Numbers and characteristics of students served  
Financial Aid Statistics: Number of students receiving assistance, number and value of awards by type  
Employment Statistics: Number of students employed on campus under various programs  
Student Fee Schedules by fee type

## Measures for Undergraduate Students: Characteristics and UCLA Careers

### Admissions Process Characteristics of Applicants, Admitted Students, and Matriculated Students

Distributions by gender, ethnicity, citizenship status, residence status, and other demographics  
Freshman or transfer entry, identification of source school and source school type  
High school or transfer GPA, SAT1/SAT2 scores, other standardized test scores as available  
Applicant transcript information: number of high school honors courses completed, etc.  
Admissions evaluation of student qualifications  
Participation in specific outreach or articulation programs  
Rate of admission (number of offers per application)  
Rate of attendance (number of matriculations per offer)

### Characteristics of Matriculated Students

Distributions of declared academic program affiliations for all enrolled undergraduates in each quarter  
Average number of primary class enrollments and student credit hours per quarter  
Academic performance: Number of units attempted and completed per quarter  
Academic performance: Cumulative GPA, quarterly honors and probation status, etc.  
Persistence rates -- numbers of students registered one year later, two years later, etc.  
Graduation rates -- number of students graduated within four years, five years, etc.  
Selected indicators of short and long term changes and trends in above measures over time

### Characteristics of Baccalaureate Degree Recipients

Selected characteristics at matriculation for specified degree cohorts  
Distributions by gender, ethnicity, citizenship status, residence status, and other demographics  
Freshman or transfer entry, identification of source school and source school type  
High school or transfer GPA, SAT1/SAT2 scores, other standardized test scores as available  
Applicant transcript information: number of high school honors courses completed, etc.  
Admissions evaluation of student qualifications  
Participation in specific outreach or articulation programs  
Selected characteristics at graduation:  
Distributions of declared academic program affiliations for all degree recipients  
Time-to-degree, measured in terms of quarters elapsed, quarters registered, etc.  
Total credit hour units accumulated, relation of this average to minimum required units  
Total credit hour units taken at UCLA and total external units applied for credit  
Average workload units attempted and completed per quarter at UCLA  
Percentage attending UCLA Summer Sessions one or more times  
Academic performance, measured in terms of honors graduates, GPA distributions, etc.

### Undergraduate Survey Information

Undergraduate surveys are conducted from time to time under various auspices in order to gather information on otherwise-unobserved aspects of institutional performance and student experience. Recent surveys of matriculated undergraduates at UCLA include the following:

#### 1997 Residential Quality of Life and Satisfaction Survey

A rich inventory of experiences and views concerning residential programs. Sample items:

- \* Percentage of residents for whom "living in on-campus housing has been a positive experience"
- \* Percentage of residents who "feel safe walking between buildings in the residential area"
- \* Percentage of residents who find "programs offered in residence halls responsive to my needs"
- \* Percentage of residents with computer in dorm room connected to campus network
- \* Percentage of residents who think residence hall alcohol policy is "too lenient" and "too strict"

#### 1997 University of California Cost of Attendance Survey

Provides common system-wide information on expenditures in many specific categories.

Results are linked by respondent to underlying student records data. Sample items:

- \* Percentage distribution of students by type of accommodation: Dormitory, apartment, etc.
- \* Percentage distribution of students by number of roommates
- \* Average monthly rent by type of accommodation
- \* Percentage of students who use an automobile to commute to and from campus
- \* Percentage of students who own a personal computer

#### 1997 ACE Cooperative Institutional Research Program Survey of incoming freshmen

A widely-used instrument focusing on attitudes and pre-matriculation experiences. Sample items:

- \* Average number of other schools to which students applied, where students were accepted
- \* Percentage of incoming students for whom UCLA was first choice school
- \* Percentage of incoming students who spent 3+ hours doing volunteer work last year
- \* Percentage of incoming students citing medicine as a probable career occupation

#### 1997 Undergraduate Experience Survey

Emphasizes undergraduate student objectives and outcomes, with sections on educational goals and progress, student satisfaction, student time commitments, and factors affecting time-to-degree.

Results are linked by respondent to underlying student records data. Sample items:

- \* Percentage of students for whom the goal of "graduating on time" is of great importance
- \* Percentage of students who report great progress toward the goal of "graduating on time"
- \* Percentage of students satisfied with the "availability of classes required to graduate"
- \* Percentage of students satisfied with the "overall quality of teaching by faculty"
- \* Percentage of students satisfied with the "general education program and GE requirements"
- \* Percentage of students satisfied with "library facilities"
- \* Percentage of students satisfied with the "overall quality of experience as a student at UCLA"
- \* Percentage of students who report degree progress significantly slowed down:
  - due to "starting one major, then changing to another"
  - due to "availability of classes you needed to stay on schedule"
  - due to "dropping or failing classes you needed to complete"
  - due to "personal or family financial circumstances"

## **Faculty Teaching Workload**

Existing measures of faculty teaching workload do not fully address the non-instructional components of faculty performance, such as the research and service, nor do they provide systematic coverage of many aspects of instructional activity itself, such as course development and planning, supervision of teaching assistants, and academic advising provided to students during office hours and at other times. Existing measures do include to some extent the teaching workload of non-faculty instructors in connection with faculty teaching.

### Measures of Faculty Teaching Resources

Number of FTE faculty positions budgeted and positions filled for current fiscal year  
Number of FTE faculty actually available for instruction  
Distributions of actual FTE faculty by appointment type, rank, or payroll title code group  
    Permanent and temporary faculty (regular rank and other faculty)  
    Regular rank faculty by rank: Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors  
    Other faculty by title code group: Visiting and Adjunct Faculty, Lecturers, Emeritus Faculty, etc.  
Number of FTE teaching assistants actually available for instruction  
  
Number of FTE faculty on sabbatical leave  
For selected units, profiles of other FTE teaching relief due to campus service, research buyouts, etc.

### Measures of Teaching Activities

Number of primary classes taught per year  
Number of primary class enrollments and student credit hours per year  
Average enrollment and average student credit hours per primary class  
Number of scheduled hours per week of primary and secondary class instruction  
Number of independent study enrollments and student credit hours per year  
Number of honors discussions and contracts per year  
Number of student research program enrollments per year  
  
Distribution of all items immediately above by course level  
Distribution of all items immediately above by instructor appointment type, rank, and title code group  
  
Number of primary classes taught per year per regular rank faculty  
Number of primary class enrollments and student credit hours taught per year per regular rank faculty  
Number of independent study enrollments and student credit hours offered per year per regular rank faculty  
Number of honors and student research program enrollments offered per year per regular rank faculty  
Percentages of regular rank faculty members teaching more or less than selected benchmark values  
  
For selected units, profiles of total credits awarded under faculty workload point systems  
  
Percentage distribution of regular rank primary classes by course level  
Percentage distribution of regular rank primary class enrollments and student credit hours by course level  
Percentage of all primary classes taught by regular rank faculty  
Percentage of all primary class enrollments and student credit hours taught by regular rank faculty  
Percentage of all independent study enrollments and student credit hours offered by regular rank faculty  
  
Similar measures for visiting and adjunct faculty, for lecturers, and for emeritus and recalled faculty  
Number of health sciences departments and faculty contributing each year to general campus instruction

### Measures of Student Satisfaction with Faculty Teaching Performance

Selected indicators from the 1997 Survey of Undergraduate Experience. For example:

- Relative importance and success in "connecting with professors on an individual basis"
- Satisfaction with "availability of faculty for office hours and consultation outside class"
- Satisfaction with "academic advising provided by faculty"

### **Research**

Measures and indicators used to assess research at UCLA are largely concerned with performance and prospects in the special area of sponsored research. Within this area, the Vice Chancellor for Research pursues a coherent strategy for assessing the research accomplishments and capacities of the campus as a whole and of individual academic departments and organized research units.

### Measures of Research Accomplishments

#### Volume and Distribution of Sponsored Research Activity

- Number of research and development awards per year by funding agency
- Dollar value of awards per year by funding agency
- Dollar value of expenditures per year

#### Intellectual Property Generation

- Number of patent disclosures, patent applications, patent awards, and patents licensed to industry

#### Impact of Research and Professional Recognition of Researchers

- Publication and citation counts as available
- Standing of academic or research units in peer/professional surveys of scholarly and research quality
- Number of faculty elected to membership in scholarly academies
- Number of faculty awards, competitive prizes, and honorary degrees

### Measures of Present Capacity and Potential for Future Research Performance

- Volume and distribution of current sponsored research awards and funding, as above
- Number of faculty and proportion of faculty conducting sponsored research
- Number of contracts and grants currently funded
- Capacity and condition of campus research facilities and equipment as described in NSF surveys
- Faculty perception of climate of support for research performance as communicated in exit surveys
- Ability to maintain creative links between teaching and research
  - Number of undergraduates involved in research through the Student Research Program and otherwise
  - Number of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars participating in the research process
  - Amount of funding for graduate research assistants and postdoctoral scholars
- Number of faculty participating in professional committees that review funding and set research agendas
- Extent and effectiveness of research mentoring programs for younger faculty
- Amount of campus funding available to match selected external grants
- Amount of campus funding available to support for risky but promising research ideas
- Amount of campus investment in faculty efforts to generating intellectual property
- Current trends in the relative cost of research administration and common services
- Number of active partnering relationships formed with industry



Appendix E:

Example of a Strategic Plan that Demonstrates Use of Data and Performance Measures  
(Excerpted)

Appendix F:

Sample Strategic Planning Information Packet  
Prepared by Office of Academic Planning and Budget

Appendix G:

Guidelines for the Self Review Component of Academic Program Review:  
Institutional and Senate Data Summaries